UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,525	11/30/2001	Yoon Kean Wong	25216-0869	1364

29989 7590 09/23/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER	
HAILU, TADESSE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,525	WONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tadesse Hailu	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 November 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the US patent application number 10/006,525 filed on 11/30/2001.

2. The pending claims 1 through 30 are examined herein as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 13, 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Clapper (US Pat No 6,704,007).

With regard to claim 1:

Clapper discloses an electronic device (10) comprising: a housing having a plurality of housing segments (segments 12 and 13); a plurality of modules (display

and keyboard modules) (Figs. 1-4), each module being encased in one of the housing segments (as illustrated in Figs. 1-4, the display and keyboard modules are encased in their respective housing); Clapper discloses a sensor (Figs. 5 and 6, #32) to detect an orientation of the electronic device (abstract, column 3, lines 56-67, column 4, lines 16-25); and Clapper further discloses a selection mechanism (processor 16) to automatically select at least one, but not all, of the plurality of modules to be active, based on the detected orientation of the electronic device (column 3, lines 29-43).

With regard to claim 2:

Clapper further discloses that each of the plurality of modules (keyboard and display modules) has a set of user-interface features (interacting with the display and keyboard) that can be at least partially controlled by the selection mechanism (processor 16), and wherein the selection mechanism enables the set of user-interface features of the at least one selected module to be operational (column 3, lines 29-43).

With regard to claim 9:

Clapper further discloses that the selection mechanism is a processor (16) configured to enable each of the modules individually (column 1, lines 38-43, column 4, lines 56-62).

With regard to claim 12:

Clapper further discloses that the selection mechanism maintains one or more non-selected modules in an inactive state in response to the detected orientation (column 3, lines 3-27).

With regard to claim 13:

Clapper further discloses that the selection mechanism detects a new orientation, and selects a different module in response to the detected new orientation (column 16-55, and also see the orientation of the device in Figs. 1-3).

With regard to claim 22:

Clapper discloses an electronic device (Fig. 1, #10): a first module (display, Fig. 1, #12); a second module (keyboard, Fig. 1, #13) coupled to the first module (see Figs. 1-4); and Clapper further discloses an orientation detection mechanism (Fig. 5, #32, Fig. 6, #32) to select one of the first module and second modules over the other of the first and second modules based on an orientation of the electronic device (column 3, lines 29-49, column 5, lines 21-35).

With regard to claim 23:

Clapper further discloses that the orientation detection mechanism (32) includes a sensor (Fig. 6, #38a-38c) that detects the orientation (abstract).

With regard to claim 24:

Clapper further discloses that the orientation detection mechanism includes a processor (Fig. 5, #16) that activates the selected module (column 1, lines 38-43).

With regard to claim 25:

Clapper further discloses that the orientation detection mechanism (32) includes a processor (16) that deactivates (via orientation change) the selected module (column 3, lines 29-43).

With regard to claim 26:

Clapper discloses an electronic device (handheld device 10) comprising a first set of user-interface features (display 12); a second set of user-interface features (keyboard 13); a detection mechanism (accelerometer 32, Fig. 5) to detect an Orientation of the electronic device (abstract); and Clapper further discloses a selection mechanism (processor 16) to automatically select one of the first or second set of user-interface features, based on the detected orientation of the electronic device (abstract, column 3, lines 29-43).

With regard to claim 27:

Clapper further discloses that the first set of user-interface features (display 12) and the second set of user-interface features (keyboard 13), wherein the first set of user-interface features (display 12) includes screen display, and the second set of user-interface features (keyboard 13) includes keyboard buttons (see Figs. 1-4).

With regard to claim 28:

Clapper further discloses a processor (16) as a selection mechanism and selects module in response to a detected orientation (abstract, column 1, lines 38-43, column 4, lines 56-62).

With regard to claim 29:

Clapper further discloses the detection mechanism is a sensor capable of detecting gravity (column 4, lines 38-47).

With regard to claim 30:

Clapper further discloses that the first set of user-interface features (display 12) is made available on a first panel, and wherein the second set of user-interface

features (keyboard 13) is made available on a second panel that opposes the first panel (see the orientation of the two features, one feature is located opposite to the other feature, see Figs. 1-4).

4. Claims 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baron et al (US pub No 2003/0038779).

With regard to claim 14:

Baron discloses a method for configuring an electronic device for use, the method of Baron includes, among other things, detecting an orientation of the electronic device (paragraphs [0007], [0019]-[0021]).

The method of Baron further includes selecting a first module from a plurality of modules to be operational based on the detected orientation of the electronic device (abstract, paragraphs [0007], and [0023]).

With regard to claim 15:

Baron further discloses detecting an orientation of the electronic device includes detecting a direction of gravity (paragraphs [0019-0020]).

With regard to claim 16:

Baron further discloses detecting an orientation of the electronic device is automatically in response to activating the electronic device (paragraphs [0027-0030]).

With regard to claim 17:

Baron further discloses detecting an orientation of the electronic device includes detecting a downward facing module, and selecting one module from a plurality of

modules includes selecting an upward facing module that opposes the downward facing module (paragraphs [0020], and [0036-0039]).

With regard to claim 18:

Baron further discloses maintaining a non-selected module in a non-active state until a new orientation is selected (paragraphs [0032-0034]).

With regard to claim 19:

Baron further discloses detecting a change in the orientation of the electronic device to a new orientation (paragraphs [0020-0021]).

With regard to claim 20:

Baron further discloses selecting a second module different than the first module in response to detecting a change in the orientation of the electronic device (paragraphs [0035-0038]).

With regard to claim 21:

Baron further discloses making the first module non-active in response to detecting a change in the orientation of the electronic device (paragraphs [0032-0034]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ijas et al (US Pub No 2002/0044425).

With regard to claim 3:

While Clapper discloses a first and second housing segments, and selecting one of the first or second housing segments, Clapper does not, however, disclose the first and second housing segments having a first and second exterior panel that provides a first and second set of user-interface features. Imai discloses a folded type portable radio communication apparatus in which it is possible to communicate in the folded state (column 1, lines 6-11). Regarding the claimed subject matter, Imai further discloses a second key operation section that is provided on the outer surface of the other of the first and second housing (abstract, column 3, lines 29-50).

Imai and Clapper are analogous are because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is manipulating interface device.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the outer operational features of the first and second housings as described in Imai with first (12) and second (13) housings of Clapper.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide operational features of the portable communication apparatus not only in opened state of the apparatus but also during closed or unfolded state.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Imai with Clapper to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

With regard to claim 4:

Clapper in view of Imai further discloses that the first exterior panel opposes the second exterior panel (see Imai, abstract, column 2, lines 43-55).

With regard to claim 5:

Clapper in view of Imai further discloses that the sensor (32) determines whether the first exterior panel or the second exterior panel is positioned downward (Clapper, column 2, lines 12-26).

With regard to claim 6:

Clapper in view of Imai further discloses that the sensor detects a direction of gravity (Clapper, column 3, lines 56-67, column 4, lines 38-47).

With regard to claim 7:

Clapper in view of Imai further discloses that the sensor is an accelerometer (Clapper, Fig. 5, #32).

With regard to claim 8:

Clapper in view of Imai further discloses that the first housing segment is detachably coupled to the second housing segment (Imai, column 2, lines 56-62).

With regard to claim 10:

Clapper in view of Imai further discloses that the first set of user-interface features includes a display and a plurality of actuatable surfaces (Imai, Figs. 2A-2B).

With regard to claim 11:

Clapper in view of Imai further discloses that the second set of user-interface features includes a display and a plurality of actuatable surfaces (Imai, Figs. 2A-2B).

CONCLUSION

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tadesse Hailu, whose telephone number is (571) 273-4051. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:00 - 630 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at (571) 273-4048 Art Unit 2173.

6. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tadesse Hailu

9/12/2004

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEI
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100